REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-18 and 25-42 remain pending, claims 1 and 10 being independent claims. Claims 1 and 10 have been amended. Applicant respectfully requests entry of these amendments, which are not believed to raise new issues requiring further consideration and/or search.

Prior Art Rejection

Claims 1-18 and 25-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,681,045 to *Lapstun et al.* (hereinafter "*Lapstun* '045") in view of U.S. Patent 6,808,330 to *Lapstun et al.* (hereinafter "*Lapstun* '330"). This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently-pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a method of managing information input via a sensor device and a position-coding pattern printed on a product. The method of claim 1 comprises: reading coordinates of the sensor device based on movement of the sensor device relative to the position-coding pattern, the position-coding pattern including marks that code coordinates on a reference surface, the reference surface including position-coding pattern portions that are used to create a plurality of product types, the position-coding pattern printed on the product including at least a first sub-pattern portion and a second sub-pattern portion; and

executing an information management function based on coordinates read from the first sub-pattern portion, the information management function managing information formed by coordinates read from the second sub-pattern portion. Claim 1 specifies that the sensor device determines a characteristic of at least one of the first sub-pattern portion and the second sub-pattern portion based on at least one coordinate read from the product and definition data stored in a memory of the sensor device. As amended, claim 1 further specifies that coordinates read from the product define multiple bit codes and that the sensor device determines a local coordinate within the second sub-pattern portion based on the definition data and at least a portion of a multiple bit code.

Therefore, claim 1 specifies that the sensor device used in the claimed information management method determines a characteristic of at least one of a first sub-pattern portion and a second sub-pattern portion of the product based on at least one coordinate read from the product and definition data stored in memory of the sensor device, and further specifies that the sensor device determines a local coordinate within the second sub-pattern portion of the product from a multiple bit coordinate code (defined by a coordinate read from the product) and definition data (stored in memory of the sensor device).

As discussed in the Reply dated November 12, 2004, *Lapstun '045* discloses a system for electronically capturing and managing

handwritten notes formed by a pen 101 on a page 1. See e.g., Fig. 2. The pen 101 interacts with coded data on the printed page 1 and wirelessly communicates with a printer 601 to transmit data created during interaction with the page 1. The printer 601 sends data to a server 10 for interpretation. Fig. 2; col. 8, lines 22-26; col. 20, lines 9-33. Based on data received from the pen 101, including the page ID, the printer 601 consults a Distributed Name System (DNS) to determine the network address of a server for receiving the data from pen 101. Col. 20, lines 9-33. The page server 10 stores a page description that allows the page server 10 to interpret the data received from pen 101 via printer 601. Col. 20, lines 29-33.

Thus, in the system of *Lapstun '045*, the network server 10 stores page layout information needed to interpret data read by the pen 101. Consequently, the technique disclosed in *Lapstun* '045 fails to read on the method currently recited in claim 1, in which the pen stores definition data that allows it to determine a characteristic of at least one of a first sub-pattern portion and a second sub-pattern portion based on at least one coordinate read from the product. Furthermore, *Lapstun* '045 fails to disclose or suggest that the sensor device determines a local coordinate from a multiple bit coordinate code and definition data (stored in memory of the sensor device) as claimed.

The Examiner's reliance on *Lapstun '330* fails to make up for these deficiencies. More specifically, in rejecting independent

claim 1, the Examiner acknowledges that *Lapstun '045* does not disclose a sensor device that determines a characteristic of at least one of a first sub-pattern portion and a second sub-pattern portion of a product based on definition data stored in the memory of the sensor device, but relies on *Lapstun '330* as allegedly making up for this deficiency. With reference to the statement in *Lapstun '330* at col. 19, lines 39-40 that "[l]ocation code interpretation usually needs to be carried out by the net page server," the Examiner seems to conclude that this statement suggests the desirability of an alternative implementation of location code interpretation performed by the pen (sensor device).[1] Applicant submits, however, that this statement fails to suggest somehow modifying the system of *Lapstun '045* to perform location interpretation based on definition data stored in the sensor device, and instead appears to teach away from such a modification.

Furthermore, assuming *arguendo* that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the sensor device of *Lapstun '045* perform "location interpretation," this modification would not result in the sensor device that determines a local coordinate within a second sub-pattern portion of the product in the manner now recited in claim 1.

[1] Although page 3 of the Office Action cites "col. 9, lines 37-40," Applicant believes that the Examiner intended to cite col. 19, lines 37-40 of *Lapstun '330*.

To establish *prima facie* obviousness, all claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art and the asserted modification or combination of prior art must be supported by some teaching, suggestion, or motivation in the applied reference or in knowledge generally available to one skilled in the art. *In re Fine*, 837, F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Thus, "[a]ll words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). The prior art must suggest the desirability of the modification in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. *In re Brouwer*, 77 F.3d 422, 425, 37 USPQ2d 1663, 1666 (Fed. Cir. 1995). It can also be said that the prior art must collectively suggest or point to the claimed invention to support a finding of obviousness. *In re Hedges*, 783 F.2d 1038, 1041, 228 USPQ 685, 687 (Fed. Cir. 1986); *In re Ehrreich*, 590 F.2d 902, 908-09, 200 USPQ 504, 510 (CCPA 1979).

At least in view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that the asserted combination of references (assuming these references may be combined, which Applicant does not admit) fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness of claim 1, or any claim depending therefrom. Claim 10 and claims depending therefrom are believed to define over the asserted combination at least based on some of the reasoning.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Conclusion

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By _____
D. Richard Anderson, #40,439

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

DRA/mag
3782-0195P